### **MEMORANDUM**

INLUC

Substitute to

Agenda Item No. 3(B)

TO:

Honorable Chairman Joe A. Martinez

and Members, Board of County Commissioners

DATE:

January 17, 2006

FROM:

Murray A. Greenberg

County Attorney

**SUBJECT:** 

Ordinance relating to

annexation; providing exception to mitigation payment for annexation

of enclave area

The accompanying ordinance was prepared and placed on the agenda at the request of Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez.

The substitute differs from the original ordinance by deleting a proposed exception to a municipality's required mitigation payment if annexing enclave areas within Commercial, Business and Industrial Areas (CBI).

Murray A. Greenberg

County Attorney

MAG/bw

# Memorandum



Date:

To:

Honorable Chairman Joe A. Martinez

and Members, Board of County Commissioners

From:

George M. Burg

County Manager

Subject:

Amendment to Miami-Dade County Code Section 20-27: Providing Exception To

Mitigation Payment For Annexation To Enclave Area.

The accompanying ordinance could have a negative fiscal impact on Miami-Dade County. The amendment exempts municipalities that annex donor enclave areas from making annual payments into the municipal services trust fund to mitigate the financial loss to the Unincorporated Municipal Service Area (UMSA) resulting from the annexation.

According to Sec 20-26 (d) of the County Code, the Board of County Commissioners already has the authority to determine the amount of an annual mitigation payment when a new annexation has a negative fiscal impact on the UMSA budget. Passage of this ordinance would restrict the Board's flexibility by eliminating mitigation payments for the annexation of enclave areas.

An unincorporated enclave is defined in Section 20-7 (A) (1) (c) of the Miami-Dade County Code as an unincorporated area surrounded on more than 80 percent of its boundary by one or more municipalities and of a size that could not be serviced efficiently or effectively. A donor area is one in which revenues provided to the County exceed the cost to the County of providing municipal services. The annexation of such an area removes the excess revenue from the UMSA budget requiring either a decrease in services to the remaining UMSA or the replacement of lost revenues from another source.

The attached summary shows that four of the fifteen existing enclaves are currently donor areas.

Enclave Area	Net Revenue Loss to UMSA Budget
El Portal – Miami	\$ 16,646
Hialeah	\$ 64,059
High Pines	\$1,331,591
Opa Locka	\$ 60,112

If all four donor enclaves were to be annexed this year, the negative fiscal impact to the County would approximate \$1,472,408 if no mitigation were collected from the annexing municipalities. This figure is net of franchise fee and utility tax collections retained by the County for annexed areas.

I strongly recommend the Board amend this ordinance to allow for mitigation payments for enclave areas but not mandate such payments. In this way the Board has maximum flexibility to deal with any unique circumstances on a case by case basis.

Assistant County Manager

# 1/6/2006ENCLAVE SUMMARY-PLV

# Estimated Fiscal Impact of Existing Enclave Areas on the UMSA Budget (based on fiscal year 2005-2006 statistics)

TAXABLE VALUE	POPULATION	POLICE CALLS	CENTERLINE MILES	GROSS REVENUE	GROSS	UMSA GAIN/LOSS
70 //8 850	4 70 00	1 073	3			
935 745 616	30 705	30,550	14 75	9000,000	#1 4 070 oos	(20),c)
000,740,010	32,703	00,00	11.70	90,000,000	\$14,9/5,825	(\$9.626.275)
506,349,503	9,076	9,096	14,35	\$2,153,075	\$3.377.787	(\$1 224 712)
0	0	46	000	<i>5</i>	\$18.880 880	(#10 ppo)
4.583.763	67	4	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	848 488	P 1 7 0 0	(4-0,000)
64 375 601	2 153	787	D 10	#3E0 740	\$ 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 0	÷ ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;
626 729 626	) i			0000,710	\$200,000	800,400
ORO, 1000	0,120	1,0,1	14./3	\$1,800,004	\$030,273	\$1,331,591
178,074,759	2,633	2,049	7.60	\$709,087	\$767,773	(\$58.686)
2,580,704,433	100,078	164,550	285.82	\$15,606,960	\$64.669.165	(\$49,062,205)
5,791,437	268	157	1.20	\$38.761	\$59.311	(\$20,550)
4,829,305	177	105	1.00	\$28.321	\$39.884	(#11 KB3)
166,002,149	4.812	5 050	14 22	200 M22	81 010 F30	(\$2.00) (\$1.00)
2000	500	375		****	91,010,020	(\$1,000,000)
0,000,400	003	3/3	1.98	\$75,390	\$140,361	(\$64,971)
2,050,837,470	39,624	30,315	30.42	\$8,967,036	\$11,454,430	(\$2,487,394)
34,719,541	0	89	0.90	\$94,057	\$33,945	\$60,112
	TAXABLE VALUE 79,448,859 935,745,616 506,349,503 0 4,583,763 64,375,601 626,728,535 178,074,759 2,580,704,433 5,791,437 4,829,305 166,002,149 8,666,463 2,050,837,470 34,719,541		1,589 32,705 9,076 0 67 2,153 3,125 2,633 100,078 268 177 4,812 603 39,624	POPULATION POLICE CALLS 1,589 1,873 32,705 39,689 9,076 9,096 0 46 67 4 2,153 782 3,125 1,674 2,633 2,049 100,078 164,550 268 157 177 105 4,812 5,050 603 375 39,624 30,315	POPULATION POLICE CENTERLINE CALLS MILES  1,589 1,873 4.22 32,705 39,689 11.75 9,076 9,096 14.35 0 46 0.00 67 4 0.05 2,153 782 6.16 3,125 1,674 14.75 2,633 2,049 7.60 100,078 164,550 285.82 268 157 1.20 177 105 1.00 4,812 5,050 14.22 603 375 1.98 39,624 30,315 30.42 0 89 0.90	POPULATION POLICE CENTERLINE GROSS CALLS MILES REVENUE  1,589 1,873 4.22 \$352,027 32,705 39,689 11.75 \$5,350,550 \$1 9,076 9,096 14.35 \$2,153,075 \$0 46 0.00 \$0 \$0 67 4 0.05 \$18,186 2,153 782 6.16 \$359,748 3,125 1,674 14.75 \$1,966,864 2,633 2,049 7.60 \$709,087 100,078 164,550 285.82 \$15,606,960 \$6 268 157 1.20 \$38,761 177 105 1.00 \$28,321 4,812 5,050 14.22 \$864,026 \$603 375 1.98 \$75,390 39,624 30,315 30.42 \$8,967,036 \$1.00 \$94,057

North Miami Beach Areas A & B are part of the same police grid. The total calls in the grid (262) were divided among the areas based upon population distribution

(Revised)

TO:	Honorable Chairman Joe A. Martinez and Members, Board of County Commission	DATE:	February 7	, 2006
FROM:	Murray A. Greenberg County Attorney	SUBJECT:	Agenda Item N	Io.
I	lease note any items checked.			
rease note any items enecreu.				
	"4-Day Rule" ("3-Day Rule" for o	committees) ap	plicable if raise	<b>d</b> .
	6 weeks required between first re	ading and publ	lic hearing	
		_		
	4 weeks notification to municipal hearing	officials requir	•	lic
		·	ed prior to pub	
	hearing	·	ed prior to pub	
	hearing  Decreases revenues or increases e	expenditures wi	ed prior to pub	

Housekeeping item (no policy decision required)

report for public hearing

No committee review

Ordinance creating a new board requires detailed County Manager's

Approvea	Mayor	Agenda Item No.
Veto	_	2-7-06
Override	_	
	ORDINANCE NO.	

ORDINANCE RELATING TO ANNEXATION; AMENDING ORDINANCE NUMBER 05-142 OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING EXCEPTION TO MITIGATION PAYMENT FOR ANNEXATION OF ENCLAVE AREA; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE

# BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1. Section 1 of Ordinance 05-142 of Miami-Dade County, Florida is hereby amended to read as follows:<sup>1</sup>

## Sec. 20-8.5. Mitigation on proposed boundary changes.

- (a) The Board of County Commissioners may require as a condition of municipal boundary change involving an area that is not revenue neutral, that the municipality shall agree to make an annual mitigation payment to the County's Municipal Services Trust Fund in the Unincorporated Municipal Services Area Budget. The amount of the annual mitigation payment shall be determined by the Board of County Commissioners. For purposes of this section, "a revenue neutral area" is defined as an area that previously, as part of the unincorporated municipal service area, generated revenues equal to or less than the cost of services provided to the area by the County.
- (b) In determining whether as a condition of any municipal boundary change the annexing municipality will be required to pay an annual mitigation payment to the County's Municipal Services Trust Fund, the Board of

Words stricken through and/or [[double bracketed]] shall be deleted. Words underscored and/or >>double arrowed<< constitute the amendment proposed. Remaining provisions are now in effect and remain unchanged.

County Commissioners may consider [[, among]] other facts deemed appropriate by the Board [[, whether the proposed annexation will eliminate enclave areas in the unincorporated area]]. >> It is provided, however, that the Board of County Commissioners shall not require annual mitigation payment as a condition of a municipal boundary change where a municipality seeks to annex an enclave area as that term is defined in Section 20-7(c).<<

\* \*

Section 2. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause or provision of this ordinance is held invalid, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected by such invalidity.

Section 3. It is the intention of the Board of County Commissioners, and it is hereby ordained that the provisions of this ordinance, including any sunset provision, shall become and be made a part of the Code of Miami-Dade County, Florida. The sections of this ordinance may be renumbered or relettered to accomplish such intention, and the word "ordinance" may be changed to "section," "article," or other appropriate word.

Section 4. This ordinance shall become effective ten (10) days after the date of enactment unless vetoed by the Mayor, and if vetoed, shall become effective only upon an override by this Board.

Mars

PASSED AND ADOPTED:

Approved by County Attorney as to form and legal sufficiency:

Prepared by:

Craig H. Coller

Sponsored by Commissioner Carlos A. Gimenez

6